

REMARKS

The present Amendment After Final is in response to the Final Office Action mailed May 22, 2006, in the above-identified application. Applicants enclose herewith a Petition requesting a three-month extension of time for resetting the deadline for responding to the Final Office Action from August 22, 2006, to and including November 22, 2006. Applicants also enclose herewith a Notice of Appeal.

As an initial matter, Applicants acknowledge and appreciate the Examiner's allowance of claim 23 and indication that claim 7 contains allowable matter.

In the present Amendment After Final, Applicants have amended claim 9 to incorporate the limitations of claim 7 therein, and canceled claims 7 and 16-22. Claims 1-4 were previously canceled. Thus, the present application now includes independent claim 9, with claims 5-6, 8 and 10-15 depending therefrom, and independent claim 23.

Applicants respectfully assert that the present Amendment After Final be entered because its entry will require no further consideration and/or search.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 20 as having an informality. In response, Applicants note that claim 20 has been canceled, which renders the objection moot.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, asserting that the phrase "the at least one lead has a first end permanently attached to said second microelectronic element and a second end releasably attached to said second microelectronic element" is indefinite. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's rejection and note that FIG. 1A of the present application shows a substrate 20 having leads 22 having first ends 24 permanently attached to the substrate 20 and second ends

26 releasably attached to the substrate 20. A detailed discussion of the claim limitation is found in paragraph [0027] of the present application. For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 13 satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and is otherwise allowable.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, asserting that the phrase "said second end of said lead is releasably attached to the first surface of said second microelectronic element" is indefinite. In response, Applicants note that claim 22 has been canceled, thereby rendering the rejection of claim 20 moot.

The Examiner rejected claims 5-6 and 8-22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) and 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 59-143352 to Okamoto et al. Referring to FIG. 3 thereof, Okamoto discloses an assembly including a polyimide flexible film 1 having a copper lead 2. A multi-layer bump 8 made of first gold layer 8b, copper layer 8a and second gold layer 8b is provided on lead 2. The assembly also includes a semiconductor element 4 having a contact pad 5. As shown in FIG. 5, the multi-layer conductive bump 8 is aligned with the contact pad 5 for interconnecting the polyimide flexible film 1 and the semiconductor element 4.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion that claims 9-15 are product by process claims because claims 9-15 are directed to a structure and do not have any process steps therein. In any event, in view of the above-noted amendments, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 9 is unanticipated by Okamoto, and that claims 5-6, 8 and 10-15 are unanticipated by virtue of their dependence from claim 9.

The Examiner also rejected claims 5-6, 8-20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) and 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,536,973 to Yamaji. Referring to FIG. 2 thereof, Yamaji discloses a semiconductor device including a first

microelectronic element 11 juxtaposed with a second microelectronic element 12. The first microelectronic element 11 includes contacts 11a and the second microelectronic element 12 includes conductive pads 12a. The device includes crushed bonding wires 13 that are attached to contacts 11a and electrically interconnected with conductive pads 12a by solder 12b.

In view of the above-noted amendments, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 9 is unanticipated by Yamaji, and that claims 5-6, 8 and 10-15 are unanticipated by virtue of their dependence from claim 9. Claims 16-20 and 22 have been canceled, thereby rendering the rejection moot.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Final Office Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he telephone Applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested Amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: November 13, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Michael J. Doherty

Michael J. Doherty

Registration No.: 40,592

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicants